

Humanist

World Digest

VOL. 26, No. 3
AUGUST, 1954

1011 Heinz Avenue
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c
\$1.00 A YEAR

"IS IT TIME FOR A NEW 'DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE'?"

By Rev. Felix Danford Lion

COBALT—THE BOMB THAT CAN END THE WORLD

By William L. Laurence

ASIA: TEN BASIC FACTS FOR AMERICANS

By Carlos P. Romulo

NEWS AND VIEWS

IDEALS TO LIVE BY

THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfilment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thralldom of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

(Successor to WELCOME NEWS)

A Quarterly of Liberal Religion

E. O. Corson, Editor. Editorial Associates: Sena Bondelle, Frantz Wertgen, Felix J. Frazer, Victor Yarros. Entered as Second-class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: Sena Bondelle, chairman; Edward L. Ericson, vice-chairman, and E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rates: \$1.00 per year. Advertising Rates: As space is available; classified ads are 10c a word. Address to Business Manager. Vol. 26, No. 3, July, August, September, 1954. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, Calif.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest. Permission granted for reproduction of original articles when proper credit is given.

"IS IT TIME FOR A NEW 'DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE'?"

Sermon delivered at the Palo Alto Unitarian Church, Feb. 28, 1954,
by Rev. Felix Danford Lion

There has been a strenuous hunt for subversives going on these past four or five years. Suspicion has become the mood of our time. All men are suspected. No one is to be trusted. The censors have their work cut out for them, and the investigators, and the undercover agents. We must beware, in view of the current eclipse of freedom, that we read only the approved publications, that we speak only the proper cliches.

Times change, and words and concepts that were popular in one generation are completely out of favor in the next. The best sellers of yesterday may turn out to be on the Index tomorrow. We must be smart to change with the temper of the times. For your enlightenment, and so that you will be able to protect yourselves against subversive material, I'll present a few samples of one-popular thought which is no longer to be condoned. Here's a first sample, clearly revolutionary and thus seditious in its scope:

"If by the mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution—certainly would if such a right were a vital one."

Clearly this sentence advocates overthrow of the government, apparently by "force and violence," for what else could revolution mean? Be thankful for the safeguards of our time, for those subversive words were delivered by, of all people, a President of the United States in his Inaugural Address. The date: March 4, 1861. Fortunately, Mr. Lincoln would not be allowed to get away with any such nonsense in our time!

Here's another example of subversion, by a man noted for his effectiveness in inciting men to revolt. Two years after writing these words he was to find himself head of our State Department, that position so sought after by rascals who would sell out our interests to the rest of the world. It's a wonder President Washington ever thought he could trust a man in his government who had written words like these:

"God forbid we should ever be twenty years without such a rebellion . . . what country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned from time to time, that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms . . . What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time, with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure."

Here, certainly, we find incitement to the overthrow of the government "by force and violence," but in those careless and unsuspecting times such a man could rise even to become President of the United States and serve a full two terms without being impeached. Fortunately, we've grown more careful since Jefferson's day.

Here's another piece of subversive literature, fortunately written so clearly that its very overtones warn men of danger. First proclaimed on July 4, 1776, it spurred men on to overthrow the government; but now we are more wary of it. In fact, in more than one court, men have been ordered thrown into jail for reading it in public, for they might incite the happy workers of coal mines or sweatshop cotton mills to become dissatisfied with their fortunate employment and to seek higher wages. That same "rascal," Jefferson, had a hand in preparing these words, too:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness . . . When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right,

it is their duty, to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."

Every nation, I suppose, has such skeletons in its closet. It is only sensible that in these troubled times we keep the closet door locked tightly.

Not so long ago a man with whom I was speaking said: "There's so much dangerous stuff being printed in books nowadays that about the only thing I dare to read anymore is my Bible."

"Hold on," I adminished him. "Even in the Bible there is much suspicious material. Remember David's revolt against Saul, for example. Remember Isaiah and the other prophets damning the legitimate kings with words like these:"

"And the kings of the earth . . . will be gathered together like prisoners in a dungeon And will be imprisoned in a prison, Until after many days they are punished." (24:21-25).

The prophet Amos said to the king:

"And I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword." (7:9).

And the prophet Zephaniah:

"Woe to the defiant and defiled one, the oppressing city! . . . Her princes within her are roaring lions; Her judges are wolves of the night, . . . Her prophets are reckless, treacherous men; Her priests profane holy things;" (3:1, 2).

All these, and many others, were preaching riot and revolution, but they were but forerunners of one who would be a more fargoing revolutionary than they, Jesus himself. The Nazarene took as his guide words from Isaiah:

"The spirit of the Lord is upon me, For he has consecrated me to preach the good news to the poor, He has sent me to announce to the prisoners their release and to the blind the recovery of their sight, To set the down-trodden at liberty, To proclaim the year of the Lord's favor." (Luke 4:18).

and he made these words come to life! He encouraged the rabble to stand up to their betters, he stirred up the downtrodden, he began to undermine the powers that were. But he couldn't get away with it for long. For a while the rabble followed him, and the Hebrew priests became uncomfortable and wondered how they could rid themselves of this threat; but the Roman governor didn't have to wonder. Rome knew how deal with rebellion, present or potential. Eternal Rome must be protected against all dangerous characters, and for this there was always the weapon of the cross.

Enough of these gloomy reminders of how even the best of men can go wrong and turn traitor to their governments. Don't putter in politics. Don't dabble in public affairs. Don't dream of glories not deserved by the common run of men. Don't get taken in by men who do deeds of righteousness simply to attract others to them for sinister ends. What was patriotic in 1861, or 1787, or 1776, or 30 A.D., or 700 B.C. becomes suspect in our "enlightened" year of 1954..

Be safe! Be sound! Be cautious! Remember the temper of the times may become even more narrow, so don't stick your neck out. Join no group, donate to no cause, read nothing. Say your prayers; work hard, keep your nose clean, and have no opinions of your own. Be like the three monkeys on the desk blotter who saw, heard and spoke no evil, nor good either, for that matter. One kind of hearing only is wise: it is smart to keep your ear to the ground.

If there is some person who is positive he knows what is right and what is wrong (and there is), listen to him, follow his lead, watch which way he might jump; for who knows, he may come out on top, and if he does it will be well to be on his, the safe, side. But be careful that the person you pick to be your leader is someone so completely loyal to himself that you know he won't sell out to any other interest. Again I say, "Be careful." Don't become suspect. Ex-Governor Earl Warren is under suspicion. His new job was almost endangered. The Army has recently been made to look a little subversive, with even some of its most heavily decorated generals put on the griddle. The State Department, of course, has a long record of doing its eager best to sell out to the Communists. Everybody is to be distrusted, except the one man who constantly points a finger at everyone else. He alone is to be trusted, because he says so himself, and he is advised by ex-communists and the **Daily Worker**. Incidentally, Elmer Davis says: "Congressional committees seem to be the only people in the country who believe what they read in the **Daily Worker**." (BUT WE WERE BORN FREE, p. 56). Davis reminds us that the word suspect is a grand old word, the favorite "of Robespierre in the Reign of Terror when he was marking off somebody for the guillotine. 'He is suspect'; that was enough. Any many people seem to hold that it is still enough." (p. 39). Well, so it is in our day. Men are becoming narrower and narrower, which is perhaps fortunate, for thus they still have room to live amid walls that are closing in on them. The National Education Association re-

ports that we have less academic freedom in the nation than in 1940. Teachers have become reluctant to discuss controversial topics for fear of getting into trouble. The colleges are investigated, and the churches, and the Army, and the State Department, and Hollywood, and the Executive Department of the Government, and anything which promises to have publicity value. Teachers sign loyalty oaths, and other state and county workers, and now the churches are to have their turn. Let's go meekly along like lambs.

But wait! Just a minute. May it not be possible that the true America can survive? Is there a chance that we may reverse the trend? Could it be that the Senator himself may be found subversive, rather than all the rest of us? Month by month freedom has been making retreats, sometimes strategic ones, at other times open flight. But now the freedom-lovers are cornered, and, with their backs to the wall, they may make a determined rally which will start the tide flowing in the other direction. Who knows? Perhaps the argument between the Senator and the Executive Department of a few days ago was the turning point. Perhaps we as individuals, but especially as churchmen, may have a hand in fighting back the enemies of freedom. One of the greatest minds of the past and present generations, Albert Einstein, tells what happened in Germany when Hitler was fighting his way to power. There is much for us to learn from this great man:

"Being a lover of freedom, when the revolution came in Germany, I looked to the universities to defend it, knowing that they had always boasted of their devotion to the cause of truth; but, no, the universities immediately were silenced. Then I looked to the great editors of the newspapers whose flaming editorials in days gone by had proclaimed their love of freedom; but they, like the universities, were silenced in a few short weeks. Then I looked to the individual writers, who, as literary guides of Germany, had written much and often concerning the place of freedom in modern life. But they, too, were mute. Only the church stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for suppressing truth. I never had any special interest in the church before, but now I feel a great affection and admiration because the church alone had the courage and persistence to stand for intellectual truth and moral freedom. I am forced to confess that what I once despised, I now praise unreservedly."

Congressmen have bowed. Senators have voted funds for a committee they claimed to despise. Most, but fortunately not

all, universities have knuckled under. Only a few editors and only a few independent writers still speak openly and vigorously for freedom. Soon only the churches will be left. It is time now to start girding ourselves for the final showdown.

There are a few allies left to us. There is Judge Learned Hand, with his ringing demand that we continue what Justice Holmes called the "open market-place of ideas:"

"Who knows but we are on a slope which leads down to aboriginal slavery? But of this I AM sure—if we are to escape, we must not yield a foot upon demanding a fair field, and an honest race, to all ideas."

There are a few commentators, as for example Elmer Davis, who makes his new book, **BUT WE WERE BORN FREE**, a vigorous sword for freedom. In it he says:

"What makes Western civilization worth saving is the freedom of the mind, now under heavy attack from the primitives who have persisted among us. If we have not the courage to defend that faith, it won't matter much whether we are saved or not."

There are a few men in public affairs, as for example an ex-President of our nation, who said in an address last fall:

"It takes faith, unselfishness, and courage to stand up to a bully; or to stand up for a whole community when it has been frightened into subjection. But it has to be done if we are to remain free.

"We have to start wherever we can—in the family, the lodge, the business community, the union, our local government, party, church—and work outward; assorting, demanding, insisting that the most unpopular persons are entitled to all the freedoms, to fundamental fairness. Almost always, the issues are raised over unpopular people or unpopular causes. In the cause of freedom, we have to battle for the rights of people with whom we do not agree; and whom, in many cases, we may not like. These people test the strength of the freedoms which protect all of us. If we do not defend their rights, we endanger our own." (Harry S. Truman at Four Freedoms Foundation Dinner.)

Now is the time, perhaps the last chance, for us, as church members, as citizens, as scholars, to fight for the freedoms without which our lives would be miserably poorer.

But hold on a minute. I don't want to get too dramatic. This isn't a case of rushing to the barricades for a fierce, but brief, pitched battle. This will be a slow, discouraging, dreary contest for small advantages, here a slightly advanced foothold, there

an unpopular figure protected from prejudice, again a law rewritten more in accord with the basic law of our land, the Constitution, with its glorious Bill of Rights.

The enemy does not wield a flashing sword but rather operates more like a dark creeping smog, gradually stealing in upon us, wrapping us in octopus-like tentacles so smoothly and slyly that suddenly we find ourselves immobilized, and, before we know it, helpless.

Tyranny doesn't appear with manacles and chains, but with little acts and rulings which at first we scarcely notice. And so we compromise, thinking that these petty issues are scarce worth fighting over, and suddenly we are bound fast. There can be no compromise with tyranny, for each compromise leaves it working toward its next encroachment. The Germans, most of them, reluctantly compromised with Naziism, a little here, a little there, gradually being pushed from bad to worse, till in the end many found themselves doing things their better natures despised.

It is time for us, today, to take our stand, while we are still able. The only ground on which we can stand is our sacred American tradition, the teaching of Lincoln, Jefferson, the Declaration of Independence, the Bible, and the United States Constitution with, I repeat, its glorious Bill of Rights. We must defend this American faith now, or it will take a generation or a century to win it back. Without it we'll have no civilization, no decency, but only the dreary nastiness of dictatorship.

In recent weeks I have spoken of the importance of man's freedom to choose, to move toward good or bad, to grow or to sink back into the mire. Howard Thurman, one of the greatest preachers of our day, spoke of this in a little piece which I would make my conclusion. I must confess that I have become a little tired of those who are always urging me to "stand up and be counted," generally for what they, not I, believe, but Thurman takes the curse off that badly worn phrase:

"Have you ever been in a position in which you had to stand up and be counted. Really! For most of us life does not make the specifically dramatic demand of taking a formal stand. A friend of mine, a teacher in a certain divinity school, found himself in a faculty split over a special issue involving one of his colleagues and students . . . one day, all members of the faculty had to take a position, for or against. To be **for**, meant to be on the side of the trustees. The issue could not be dodged; a position had to be taken. My friend took a positive stand on an

issue that was vital to him and his security, for the first time in his life. His convictions put him on the side of the minority. The next fall, he was teaching at another school. In commenting on the situation he said, 'For the first time in my life, I felt that I was a man. It was the first time that I could not hedge, but instead I had to take sides in accordance with the integrity of my convictions without regard to possible consequences. I became a new person, way down deep.'

Who knows, but in the battle ahead we may not become new persons "way down deep," persons able to grow through every vicissitude and to emerge victorious of spirit?

* * *

COBALT—THE BOMB THAT CAN END THE WORLD

By WILLIAM L. LAURENCE

The new chemical compound that has revolutionized the production of the hydrogen bomb now makes it certain that the most dreaded weapon of all—the cobalt bomb—can also be successfully built.

The cobalt bomb is a hydrogen bomb of the type tested successfully at the Eniwetok Proving Grounds in the Pacific March 1 and 26. The principal difference is in the material of the shell surrounding the active ingredients.

Instead of a shell of steel, which becomes only mildly radioactive as it turns into a cloud of vapor, a shell of cobalt encases the fission and fusion substances. On being vaporized in the explosion, it is transformed into a deadly radioactive cloud 320 times more powerful than radium.

This cloud can travel with the prevailing winds over distances of thousands of miles, destroying all life in its path. The bomb could be exploded from a ship in the Pacific, for example, hundreds, even thousands, of miles from the coast and the cloud would travel with the winds toward the United States West Coast and the rest of the North American Continent.

It is this type of hydrogen bomb of which Albert Einstein said: "If successful, radioactive poisoning of the atmosphere, and hence annihilation of any life on earth, will have been brought within the range of technical possibilities."

At the time Professor Einstein spoke—early in 1950—the cobalt bomb was merely a theoretical possibility, as was the hydrogen bomb. The successful tests at Eniwetok in March have thus brought Professor Einstein's prophecy into the realm of fact.

It is, of course, obvious from the nature of the weapon that

it can never be tested in the Pacific, or anywhere else in the world, for that matter. But the successful tests at Eniwetok also made it obvious that no such tests are necessary.

Such tests, in fact, have already been made on a small laboratory scale. These have proved that, when cobalt is bombarded with neutrons, it is transformed into a deadly radioactive powerful gamma rays, that is, powerful radiations similar to X-rays, 320 times more powerful than the gamma rays given off by radium.

It had therefore been known for some time that if a hydrogen bomb could be successfully built and tested, all that would be necessary would be to substitute a shell of cobalt for the conventional steel shell of the weapon.

Thus, the successful tests March 1 and 26 of the latest model hydrogen bombs—"tremendous blast in the megaton range"—also may be said to have been successful tests of the cobalt bomb in the megaton range. A megaton is equal to a million tons of TNT.

The hydrogen bomb, as it explodes, produces enormous quantities of neutrons in two ways. It is first triggered by a powerful fission bomb of the latest design, which is in itself equal to 500,000 tons of TNT. The fission process releases great quantities of neutrons.

The fission process also produces tremendous temperatures, of the order of several hundred million degrees Centigrade. This temperature produces fusion of nuclei of heavy hydrogen, deuterium and tritium, which, in turn, yield, much greater quantities of neutrons.

Because the cobalt bomb could be exploded from an unmanned barge in the middle of the ocean it could be made of any weight desired. It could, for example, in addition to its normal fission and fusion constituents, incorporate as much as a ton of deuterium.

Such a monster would yield as much as 250 pounds of free neutrons. These would produce 75 tons of radioactive cobalt, equal to nearly 5 million pounds of radium.

What has made this monster a last possible is the new chemical compound lithium 6 deuteride, composed of the light isotope of lithium of atomic mass six (three protons and three neutrons) and the heavy isotope of hydrogen, that is, deuterium of atomic mass two (one proton and one neutron).

Ironically, there is another type of "cobalt bomb" being used as a substitute for radium in the treatment of cancer. This "cobalt

bomb" consists of a small quantity of cobalt exposed to neutrons in a nuclear reactor.

A cobalt bomb, incorporating a ton of deuterium, according to Prof. Harrison Brown, nuclear chemist at the California Institute of Technology, could be set in the Pacific about a thousand miles west of California.

"The radioactive dust," he said, "would reach California in about a day, and New York in four or five days, killing most life as it traverses the continent."

"Similarly," he added, "the Western powers could explode hydrogen-cobalt bombs on a north-south line about the longitude of Prague that would destroy all life within a strip 1,500 miles wide, extending from Leningrad to Odessa, and 3,000 miles deep, from Prague to the Ural Mountains. Such an attack would produce a 'scorched earth' unprecedented in history."

Prof. Leo Szilard, of the University of Chicago, one of the principal architects of the atomic bomb, has estimated that 400 one-ton deuterium-cobalt bombs would release enough radioactivity to extinguish all life on earth.

With permission from Democratic Digest of June, 1954; condensed from New York Times.

* * *

ASIA: TEN BASIC FACTS FOR AMERICANS

By CARLOS P. ROMULO

General Carlos P. Romulo, 55, is a Renaissance personality: He has been a playwright, college teacher, newspaperman, radio broadcaster, Boy Scout leader, soldier, public-relations man, political leader and diplomat. A veteran of Bataan, he won the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished correspondence in 1941 before entering Philippine President Manuel Quezon's war cabinet. Since the end of World War II, he has been the Philippines' permanent delegate to the United Nations, serving as President of the UN General Assembly in 1949. This article is based on a recent address by General Romulo at the commencement of the University of Seattle.

The most dynamic single fact of our time is the awakening of Asia. This must be true, because everybody outside of Asia seems to know about it and speaks about it constantly.

In Asia, however, since we are right in the middle of it, we do not talk about it. We simply adjust ourselves to the fact, and we keep on with the process of awakening. Therefore, to us in Asia the most significant fact of our time is rather America's awakening to the awakening of Asia.

Let us alert the American people to the present crisis in Asia. But let us not reduce them to wringing their hands helplessly,

not knowing what to do about it. The method of trial and error, the technique of improvisation, no matter how cleverly managed, will no longer do. Though we are racing toward catastrophe, there is still time to do some hard thinking and intelligent planning for the difficult tasks that confront us.

There is no excuse for hazy thinking about Asia. For it is not true that Asia is mysterious, enigmatic and unpredictable. This outdated notion is merely an excuse for insufficient action or postponement of action or no action at all. Once it is realized that Asia is in a state of revolutionary ferment, one knows for a certainty that there is going to be an explosion of some kind, unless we do something to prevent it. That is almost as certain as the physical fact that the dynamite stick with a lighted fuse will explode unless we step on the fuse and put it out in time.

It is important to remember that there is no mystery about what hungry, impoverished and oppressed peoples will do in the end, if no relief is forthcoming. Asians are also human beings, and what Europeans or Americans would do or have done in the same circumstances the Asians will do also. Skin pigmentation has nothing to do with it, nor the fact that they subsist on rice.

The Asian peoples are so much older than the peoples of the West that the latter can hardly claim to have invented revolution. After all, it was the Chinese who invented gunpowder, though they left it to the Western peoples to use it to propel bullets to kill fellow human beings. The Asians will also react just as quickly to sympathy and understanding, and will prize no less dearly the blessings of prosperity and freedom. They are quite human that way, too.

Wherein, then, lies the mystery or the enigma? Asia is no longer mysterious, resigned or meek. Asia has become too real, challenging and proud to warrant further recourse to such illusions.

To understand Asia, it is necessary, first of all, to realize that many of its problems will not yield to pat, easy solutions. One such solution is embodied in the common notion that Asia must somehow be saved. But saved for what ends? In whose interest? And by what means?

To these questions we have so far no clear answers. It is not wholly certain that it is meant to save Asia in the interest of its own peoples. Nor is it unmistakably plain that the intention is to save Asia by means other than military.

I do not speak as an expert on Asia, or even as a spokesman

for Asia. However, anyone who has studied the situation in Asia no further back than the last decade will be in substantial agreement with a capsule analysis of the Asian problem which I have tried to formulate in the following terms:

1. The Asian peoples will no longer tolerate the shackles of colonialism. What they want is a status of equal partnership and voluntary cooperation with other peoples.

2. The Asian peoples are fired with an aspiration to human dignity and economic well-being which can no longer be held in abeyance.

3. The Asian peoples will not fight for the vague concept of a free world; they will fight on the side of the free world only if they have a stake in freedom themselves.

4. The West must work with and through the responsible nationalist movements in Asia rather than through puppet regimes that have no popular support. By denouncing and opposing genuine freedom movements in Asia as Communist-inspired, the West in fact exposes such movements to Communist infiltration and control. The objective must be to isolate Communist agitation from the legitimate nationalist aspirations of the Asian peoples. After achieving independence, countries like India, Indonesia, Burma and the Philippines have shown themselves quite capable of combatting Communist influence in their midst.

5. Military measures are at best a short-term device for staving off an immediate threat of Communist aggression. The long-term struggle against Communism, however, requires economic and financial assistance that will enable the Asian peoples to raise their standards of living.

6. Assistance should be offered on a basis of equality and mutual respect, and not as a special favor with political strings or as a disguised survival of colonialism.

7. As there can be no world peace without Asia, so there can be no economic stability in the world without Asia. You cannot neglect Asia and, by continuing to pour dollars into Europe, expect to stabilize the world economy, including the European economy itself.

8. Asian political, economic and social organization is predominantly on an authoritarian pattern. Therefore, it should not be assumed that the Asian peoples will automatically adopt democracy of the Western type; rather, they will adopt it with necessary modifications and only as it demonstrates its superiority in the actual experience of daily life.

9. Asian neutralism must be recognized partly as the result

of a genuine desire for peace, partly as dictated by the serious internal problems of many countries in the region, and partly as inspired by a lingering distrust of the motives of the colonial powers.

10. The Asian peoples will not give their support to any program, policy or course of action affecting Asia that is taken without consulting them. In the Southeast Asia Conference held in Baguio in May, 1950, on the invitation of the Philippine Government, the representatives of seven countries in the region solemnly affirmed that "in the consideration of the special problems of South and Southeast Asia, the point of view of the peoples of this area be kept in mind, by any conference dealing with such problems, so that better understanding and cordial relations may subsist between the countries in the region and other countries in the world."

At this juncture of history, America has a splendid opportunity to proffer the hand of friendly understanding to Asia, in the certain knowledge that the hand will be grasped with equal friendliness and with gratitude. People who have traveled in Asia will testify that its people are the humblest, most hospitable and friendly you can find in the world. They have all the fine qualities of men who live close to the soil and cleave to it as to a mother. And their sense of gratitude is the type that leans over backward and manifests itself to excess.

The hard-headed, practical American will sometimes be embarrassed by this Asian trait. But the American is also a generous, warm-hearted human being, and this quality appeals strongly to the Asian character. Therefore, beneath the outward differences there is much that Americans and Asians have in common.

Friendly cooperation between Asia and America is the greatest thing that can happen in the world. To me, as a child of Asia and, as it were, a foster-child of America, nothing could be more inspiring than the spectacle of the oldest and the youngest of continents clasping hands and standing together to defend the frontiers of freedom.

With permission from the New Leader of June 21, 1954
* * *

To say that two is company and three is a crowd is to make a very temporary statement. After a short time satiety or use and wont has crept sunderingly between the two, and, if they are any company at all, they are bad company, who pray discreetly but passionately for the crowd that is censured by the proverb.—James Stephens.

NEWS AND VIEWS

CHARGES 'REVOLUTION FROM RIGHT' IS IN THE MAKING

"Revolution from the Right" is the title of a remarkable article written by Robert G. Lewis and published in the July issue of the official magazine of the National Farmers' Union, which is the leading organization of "family type" farmers. Lewis is on the organization's Washington staff.

The article, a startling one, begins with this striking paragraph:

A totalitarian revolutionary movement is being developed in the United States. It seeks far-reaching and fundamental changes in the American way of life, in the laws of the land, and even in the form of our government.

"The totalitarian movement here closely parallels the totalitarian movements of Naziism, Fascism and Communism," the article declares. **"It is being led by wealthy business interests to solidify and extend their social and political power. For lack of a better name, it might be called 'Corporate Socialism.'**

"Corporate Socialism is moving unmistakably in the direction of a cohesive movement, with recognized leaders, increasing agreement on ideology, and a widening pattern of immoral methods.

"Business concentration has proceeded at a breath-taking pace since World War II began. At present, domination of every important industry except agriculture is concentrated in the hands of one, two or three big corporations. Some huge corporate institutions dominate several entire industries."

"These immense monopolies," the article continues, "are so powerful that they have no real competition. They fix the prices and pile up profits. Also, their wealth and power are constantly increased by their connections with big banks and insurance companies, and by the huge subsidies of various kinds which they get from the government.

"This concentrated control over the American economy," the article says, "is a revolutionary change and has great political and social implications. Totalitarian movements always are a response to some kind of revolutionary situation—drastically altered economic, social and political relationships.

"The totalitarian factions among those who control American corporations are trying—with their propaganda—to stabilize the newly-achieved concentration of power. To do so, they realize that their economic domination must be extended into the political

and intellectual fields. That is what furnishes the steam behind the growing movement of totalitarian Corporate Socialism."

It is backed by such mighty groups as the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the biggest farm organization—the National Farm Bureau Federation—which is ruled by representatives of "landlord farmers" and Wall Street interests.

Despite their great and growing power, the Corporation Socialists know that, to put over their totalitarian schemes, they must fool many of the American people and get a lot of fanatical followers who don't know what they are doing, just as Hitler did in Germany.

Therefore, the article explains in detail, the Corporate Socialists here are doing just what Hitler's "National Socialists"—similarly backed by Big Business—did in Germany. They are using the people's legitimate fear of communism as "a material to create scapegoats."

These scapegoats are not Communists, the article points out. They are political, religious and educational leaders who dare to stand up against the totalitarian program of the Corporate Socialists. By smearing them, the article shows, the Corporate Socialists hope to beat down opposition to their ultimate program of a dictatorship that would turn back the clock on social gains and subvert democracy.

THE MILITARY TAKES OVER

By JOHN M. SWOMLEY, Jr.

Militarism is alien to the American tradition. From the very beginning of the national life of the United States, a suspicion of professional military forces, sometimes referred as to "standing armies," has resulted in an emphasis on civil control of military power.

From the beginning, therefore, the American government used certain devices to curb military influence in American life. One of these was to put the power to raise and support armies in the hands of a civilian Congress. A condition that no appropriations might be made for the Army for more than a two-year period guaranteed periodic review of military policies.

No similar provision was made with respect to the Navy, partly because a permanent Navy seemed essential to guard against enemies who could not reach America without crossing an ocean, and partly because there was no tradition in the Anglo-Saxon world of naval attempts to establish a dictatorship, as there had

been in the case of the army. The second device, therefore, was one of placing an emphasis on naval rather than military power.

A third device was that of providing for some decentralization of military power by provision for "democratic state militia" who would have no permanent professional officer caste such as would develop in a centralized standing army. This militia was intended partly as a restraint upon the seizure of power by a central professional military force.

A fourth device was that of having only a very small professional army, that could be expanded in time of war and reduced drastically in time of peace.

A fifth device was that of making the President, a civilian, the commander-in-chief of the military forces without the power to declare war or appropriate money for the military establishment.

It is important, however, to note that these safeguards against military control could be effective only so long as public opinion remained opposed to militarism. As Dean Louis Smith put it in his **American Democracy and Military Power**: "Civil dominance, regardless of how securely grounded it may be in the Constitution and in the statutes, is not self-implementing. Like any other principle it must be cherished in the public mind if it is to prevail."

Beginning with the Second World War, public opinion in the United States changed. A public opinion poll would still reflect an overwhelming opposition to the idea of militarism as such, but there would undoubtedly be support for the specific things that, taken together, constitute militarism.

As the power relations in the international scene shifted and the technology of war improved, public opinion changed. With only one major enemy — Russia and its allies — confronting America and its allies, many of whom could not be defended by a navy, the Army was not cut back drastically in the post-war period. It numbered more than a half million men in the first few years, partly because of garrison duty abroad; subsequently it became much larger because of the Korean war and the unsettled world situation.

The development of air power, atomic and hydrogen bombs, resulted in more emphasis on an air force which, although originally a part of the Army, is now a separate, large and powerful group.

The large size of the Army and Air Force, together with the

need for long-term specialists to handle the complicated technological improvements, have tended to increase the size of a permanent professional officer group. It also has tended to nullify the traditional dependence of the nation on the state militia. In line with this, the Army goal is one of federalizing the state militia so as to render its military control complete. Upon several occasions in the postwar period, Army spokesmen have advocated such federalization of the National Guard.

The growth of a large Army and Air Force has resulted also in a relative decrease in the importance of the Navy. This demphasis of the Navy was carefully planned and promoted by the Army and Air Force through the device of unification of the Armed Forces. The Navy, however, understood what was involved and opposed unification.

The ultimate logic of unification in the thinking of Army leaders was to establish a supreme General Staff nominally under civilian control but practically in complete command. Gen. George C. Marshall made this clear in his original proposal for unification. He wrote:

"There should be a Chief of Staff to the President, to serve the President in exercising his functions as constitutional Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. He would take precedence over all military and naval officers. On matters relating to strategy, tactics, and operations, the preparation and presentation of the joint military budget, and on such other matters as he may consider pertinent to his constitutional function as Commander-in-Chief, the President should communicate his instructions to the Department of War through the Chief of Staff to the President. In all other matters, the President's orders should be transmitted through the Secretary of War."

James Forrestal, when he was Secretary of the Navy, told a District Commandants' conference, January 31, 1947, that Army and Air Force efforts "were based, and always have been, upon the concept of a single control of all military effort, that control nominally vested in a civilian, but in actual practice and result, really in the hands of one military Chief of Staff.

The development of many complicated weapons, the production of ammunition for small wars and preparation for large ones, has resulted in the granting of authority by Congress to the military to let long-term contracts. The result is that Congress has lost practical control of the military, as was indicated in a report in the September 15, 1951, New York Times:

"The Joint (Congressional) Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures agreed informally today that Congress had practically lost control of the Government's purse-strings. . . . The Committee heard Roswell Magill of New York, former Under-Secretary of the Treasury, testify that only about \$24,000,000,000, or slightly more than one-third of the President's budget for the present fiscal year, was subject to reduction by Congressional action on appropriations. This is due largely to the fact that more than \$34,000,000,000 of the budgeted expenditures will be made from appropriations and other obligational authority granted in previous years. Other 'untouchable' expenditures are fixed by statutory formulas, contracts, treaties and other such factors."

Another way of stating this is seen in the following excerpt from the December, 1952, *Combat Forces Journal*:

"It is impossible for any one Congressman or Senator, or even a group of Congressmen or Senators, to be expert on every facet of the defense budget. And so they must accept the explanations of the witnesses — and anyone who knows much about these things, knows that the testimony of the experienced soldier wearing stars is most persuasive of all."

Even the constitutional safeguard which makes the President the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces is no guarantee of civil supremacy. This is especially true when society assigns the highest prestige to a professional military officer and by election makes him the "civilian" Commander-in-Chief. The December, 1952, *Combat Forces Journal* recognized this trend with its comment:

"A half generation of war, uneasy peace, and more war has been our recent lot. And as professional military men necessarily moved up into positions of great responsibility and trust, politicians have sought to enroll this or that General or Admiral in their party and put him up for high office."

But even when a real civilian is the President, his hands are largely tied by the bigness of government. He has to delegate authority to heads of departments who in turn must rely largely on the "career" people within the departments. In the Federal Government today there is a myriad of military and semi-military organizations, some of them headed by short-term civilian appointees and some by military personnel. The real power in this system lies with the professional military group rather than the nominal civilian heads. This is especially true when the pro-

fessional military group is cohesive, articulate, and ambitious, and when there is in the United States no equally cohesive and articulate civilian group with enough prestige and with enough conviction to try to curtail military power.

All of the original devices intended by the founders of our country to safeguard the nation from military control have now been changed or largely nullified. Whether or not the framework of civilian control remains, the substance is increasingly military control.

This is not to suggest that America is now a perfect illustration of the garrison state. It has not yet reached that point, even though it is moving in that direction. Dean Louis Smith has defined a garrison state as "a state on a permanent war footing, with the population in genuine fear of imminent conflict, so unlimited in its nature as to involve the total resources of the nation and so uncertain in its outcome as to necessitate the subordination of every consideration of democracy, or welfare, to 'military necessity.' . . . It is a state in which such vast numbers of men and women are called into required military service under such extensive indoctrination that the distinction between citizen and soldier becomes blurred in the general tendency to view everything from military frames of reference."

He added that the economy is "dominated by the military and having as its sole objective the attainment of maximum military power. Force either as threat or in actuality, becomes the naked and unique basis for conducting diplomatic negotiations and the settlement of international differences."

The United States military establishment is now operating on the assumption that the nation is on a permanent war footing. Demands for permanent military conscription, talk of conscription for civil defense, plans for conscription of women, are only a few illustrations of what the military has in store for America if public opinion continues to turn in the direction of militarism.

The above article is followed by a summary of the extent of military influence and control over American life will indicate how far we have moved from the American tradition of civil democracy.

Quoted from a booklet "Our Military Government," published by National Council Against Conscription, 1013 - 18th St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

* * *

The government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion.—George Washington.

AFRICA: RESOLUTIONS ARE NOT ENOUGH

By JOHN HATCH

The Socialist Movement has always been essentially an international organization seeking not just a Socialist Britain, but a Socialist world. This fact is recognized by the number of international resolutions on the agenda of the annual conference and by the serious debates which take place on these issues.

Throughout this century we have been repeatedly reminded of the influence of international events upon every detail of our personal and national life, and our Labor governments have constantly been hamstrung in their socialist endeavors by the absence of similar governments in other parts of the world.

Awakening Continent

But there is one sphere in which we are or can be almost masters of our policy. In spite of outside influences, in the colonies Britain can to a large extent determine her policy at Westminster with the confidence that it will be carried out if she so wills. Above all this is true, and significantly true, in Africa.

In this rapidly awakening continent, we directly govern the life of 60 million people and powerfully influence the fate of another 150 million. British African policy sets the course for the whole continent, and that policy will determine what form the future society of the last of the world's continents is to take. Labour's African policy will decide whether or not we can expect this new continent to enter the community of socialism and democracy, or to become its dangerous enemy.

It is no exaggeration to say that Africa is the focal point of international living today. Far above even the issue as to whether 150 million American individualists can live peacefully with 200 million Russian collectivists is the question as to whether white can live harmoniously beside black, brown, or yellow.

Political ideologies are transitory; skin color is permanent. And the whole world is rapidly recognizing that the question will be decided primarily in the continent of Africa.

It is in this continent that the closest and most complex contact between white and non-white takes place and where the peoples are most sensitive about the problem. The Labour Movement has traditionally been violently opposed to imperialism in all its forms, yet we can never ignore the past and the problems which it has left. It is not sufficient merely to demand that Britain leave Africa and hand over all responsibility to its indigenous

peoples, for in so doing we should also leave to them all the problems we have helped to create.

Help Needed

Without British help the development of health, education, administration, and strong economies would be long delayed, while, at least for a time, the white settlers would be enabled to exercise dictatorial powers. On the other hand, we have to avoid thinking in the terms of the Tories, who always recognize the white settlers as a part of their community from which the indigenous peoples are excluded. The prestige of Labour has already been dangerously prejudiced in Africa by the attitude to Seretse Khama and by the divided and sometimes hesitant approach to Federation.

What is mostly clearly needed amongst Socialists is, first, a thorough knowledge of the facts and situation, based on a realist assessment, not simply on sentiment, and secondly, a real planned solution, founded on the socialist principle of the essential equality of human rights.

Those principles must be clearly and unequivocally stated, as must our socialist policy for each of the African territories, for it cannot be too greatly emphasized that arguments on legalism and technicalities appear in Africa to be mere covering for cowardice and expediency. The attitude of Labour governments at the United Nations with South African policy was debated was always seen in this light.

Nor is it enough to pass resolutions at our conferences, even if we intend sincerely to carry them out when next in power. We Socialists, like the rest of the British people, owe much of our superior standard of life and opportunities to the exploitation of the African people—even though it was against our will. We owe them some recompense. We have a strong and wealthy movement. We must accept our responsibilities now.

New Commonwealth

As the amendment on the agenda from Kensington South C.L.P. suggests, we could well now send them to assist in the Trade Union and Co-operative development of the African peoples. I would also include socialist educationalists, capable of assisting the Africans to develop rapidly political, social and economic knowledge and so enable them to fight for and accept their responsibilities in their own societies—just as we develop our own educational facilities to allow the working class here

to fight for power and accept its responsibilities. Here is something which we can **do now**, not just discuss.

Moreover, we should remember that we are now a member of a great experiment in international living in the new Commonwealth. This organization has been transformed from a white man's club into an inter-racial organism of vast significance.

The African problem affects its very life. India- Pakistan and Ceylon all have a direct interest in the African situation and should be brought in as partners in its solution. If the Commonwealth is to survive, if inter-racial equality and co-operation is to be established as a practice as well as a principle of international life, if discussion instead of bombing is to become the method of settling international differences—then the racial issue of Africa has to be faced and solved.

Otherwise the Commonwealth will break up and the one force which might save the international situation and abolish racial tension will have been destroyed. Only a socialist policy can avoid this tragedy, but to achieve it Socialists must think clearly and act.

—Forward, Britain

* * *

BLESSED NOTHINGNESS

Sometimes we still read the admonition to clergymen to preach the gospel and leave social problems alone.

Today a clergyman may lead his people back into the life of Biblical people and no one is worried. But at no time in history have there been events so significant for the future of the human race. Beside these current events the Biblical episodes are microscopic and irrelevant.

I suspect no clergyman was ever suspended from his pulpit for talking about the goodness of God or the felicity of heaven, topics on which there is absolutely no data. But a trained scholar can become competent on a social question because the facts may be dug out, and appraised. Many denominations are infested with that type of lay person who is happy if his parson talks about something which, in the nature of the case, no one knows anything; but is disturbed if his parson talks about something contemporary about which it is possible to become informed. Religion that cannot be applied to the current common concerns of mankind is a sickly thing.

—Ram's Horn

EDITORIAL

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

In recent months legislation has been passed by the Congress and signed by the President, which bridges that gulf of separation of Church and State that was supposedly so firmly established by Article I of the Bill of Rights, namely, that: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

These two specific pieces of legislation referred to are (1) the approval of the issuance of postage stamps with the imprint of "In God We Trust," and (2) the words "Under God" which were added to the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. These pieces of legislation are, it seems, certainly not in accord with the expressed intent of the writers of the Bill of Rights. Thomas Jefferson, for example, a man unsurpassed in clearness of vision and insight, a man of unfathomable and practical acuity, once commented in this manner when he sensed a breach of the right to freedom of religion in a situation similar to this:

"The bill for establishing religious freedom in the United States, the principles of which had, to a certain degree, been enacted before, I had drawn in all the latitude of reason and right. It still met with opposition; but, with some mutilations in the preamble, it was finally passed; and a singular proposition proved that its protection of opinion was meant to be universal. Where the preamble declares that coercion is a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion, an amendment was proposed by inserting the words "Jesus Christ so that it should read, "a departure from the plan of Jesus Christ, the holy author of our religion"; the insertion was rejected by a great majority, in proof that they meant to comprehend, within the mantle of its protection, the Jew and the Gentile, the Christian and Mohammedan, the Hindoo, and infidel of every denomination."

As religious Humanists, we are grateful to Thomas Jefferson for leaving for posterity the above statement of the foundation around which, in part, the Bill of Rights was formed, and we regret that the Congress and the President evidently have not now given due and careful consideration to the rights of religious liberties for all our people, in their interpretation of Article I.

And now to give a yet more vivid picture of man and our friends and neighbors in a vast controversy around the myths

of the gods, and man's responsibility to man in this world versus the gods of mythology, one might quote as follows from **Man and His Gods** by Prof. Homer W. Smith:

"All human history reveals that transcendental metaphysics is not only futile but dangerous. Those who have foisted, frequently by not too honest means, their unsupported speculations upon the naive and gullible as truth have served to retard man's self-realization more than any other misfortune that has ever befallen him. History also reveals that man does not need any brand of transcendental metaphysics—his lasting contentments and achievements he has found wholly within the frame of reference that takes things as they are in the here and now. No pattern of living is written in the stars: each may be tried and esteemed according to the individual. No principle of justice is foreordained; justice must be realized between individuals as a reasoned compromise. No value can be capitalized; all values are fluxions in vital dynamics. No supernal power can aid him: he must find within himself the creative vision, the courage and the will for his fulfillment.

"Unhappiness, whether avoidable or not, too frequently comes in large pieces. But happiness is generally as fine-grained as life itself, and so intimately intermixed with living that it can be extracted from breathing, eating, sleeping, waking, from the humblest labor, from all achievement and creation and understanding, and few men need fail to accumulate a goodly store of it; all men can accumulate a larger store. Man does not need a machine to manufacture happiness, or an oracle to tell him where to find it; it is a by-product of life, needing only to be separated from a dross of want and pain. When the scales weigh down beneath the latter, his self-reliance will not fail him; he will fall back on that most elemental of animal virtues—courage. A man can lose his god but he cannot lose himself.

"His fate was not decreed in the temple of Orisis, or written on the tablets of Marduk, or settled by Olympian conclave or predestined by a righteous Yahweh—he has always had it clutched in his own hands; he need but open his fingers to read his lifeline; he need but close them resolutely upon the task in order to turn his dreams into reality. Then he will pronounce life good and cease to worry about that which at present lies beyond his ken, nor look back at the phantasmagoria that mark the past.

"It is up to him. He alone by his own efforts can enlarge the

bounds of empire, to the effecting of all things possible, to remolding this sorry scheme of things nearer to the heart's desire. He alone can see himself and his world in width and depth. He alone can choose, out of his vision of the present and the past, his future course."

The above words of Prof. Smith are milestones for man and his future on this earth. They must not be impeded by those who use the gods to attract his attention, while they fleece him of his birthright, as for example, the recent 12-billion-dollar give-away and the substitution of other gods, such as were evidenced in Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini.

Some heads of ecclesiastical groups are also examples: See the article dealing with Corporate Socialism in this issue, and mark what it means to our average voter. To enlarge on this thought, the book **From Gods to Dictators** by Pryn's Hopkins will be enlightening.

The Newsweek magazine of June 21, 1954, disclosed that the addition of "Under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance was first suggested by the Knights of Columbus in 1951 and was pushed to a successful conclusion, along with the stamp statement "In God We Trust," by an individual who received a Christopher award for his services.

"Under God," in totalitarian ecclesiastical vocabularies, incurs an enlarged meaning. Where the full program of the church is complete, it is enlarged to mean, "under Pope", "under Church", and "under Priest".

Where the one-Church state is all-powerful, and where it in turn controls the educational facilities, the records show that the people of these countries average around 85 percent illiterate.

Protestants and other Americans have come to the realization of the fact that the Catholic Church, when it functions as a minority, has a program designed to preach tolerance; when it becomes equal in numbers to other groups combined, demands equality; and when it functions as a majority, exterminates or makes impotent all other religious faiths. Obvious examples of their work in this way can be seen in Spain, Portugal and in the South American countries. In these countries they predominate. The most blatant display of their tactics can be seen in Colombia where no Protestant, Humanist or other faith is permitted to exist openly. During the Inquisition, or during the establishment of the Christian religion in Europe, this procedure is said to have

cost over 8 million lives; and in Mexico and Peru, 12 million. It still goes on.

A thinking man wonders, with the enactment of this recent legislation, if the Congress and the President realized that in these recent legislative actions they were aiding and abetting those who plan a one-church state in the United States. If not, we ask our members of Congress to be more diligent in protecting the constitutional rights of ALL religious groups as set up in the Bill of Rights.

A word to our fellow religionists in the Catholic Church: we suggest that you get down to earth and humanize and democratize your faith and become faithful servants of a democratic nation and world.

The recent congressional action, which has been brought about mainly through your efforts, puts those of us who place our faith in man and the world he lives in, in a most difficult position. You may have your pie in the sky when you die, but we Humanists are interested in sharing and making this a democratic and peaceful world worth living in here and now.—E.O.C.

* * *

ANSWERING SOME COMMON OBJECTIONS TO HUMANISM

By REV. EUGENE KREVES

Aren't Humanists Rather Arrogant in Their Reliance Upon Reason?

The position which the religious humanist takes is much more humble than that taken by the religious supernaturalist. We are much more restrained in our assumptions and do not permit our convictions to run ahead of and, more especially, contrary to available facts. We feel that in refusing to further an anthropomorphic conception of God we are actually more reverent than the personalistic supernaturalist.

How Can You Believe in Man After Seeing What Man Has Done to Himself?

Religious humanists do not subscribe to any theory of human depravity, nor, for that matter, to any theory of automatic human perfection. We base our belief in man upon a long-term perspective. Insofar as the history of life on earth is known, man is a relatively recent species. The development of ethics and ideals is even more recent. Man has not fallen; he has risen and must continue to rise to still higher spiritual levels of life. This con-

tinuing rise of man may not be upon a persistent upward continuum. There may be intermediate falls and rises, but the general trend over a long, long period of human history is upward.

Humanism Never Will Succeed Because it Places too Much Reliance Upon Reason Rather Than Upon the Emotions.

Humanism is succeeding now for those who are mature or seeking to become mature. The spiritual dynamic is not lacking in religious humanism. It is found in the social idealism which humanism furthers. There is ample room in religious humanism for the emotional factors which can enrich human life. Humanism would help man guide his emotional life and allow reason to set the goals for his dynamic. Among religious humanists there is an emphasis upon aesthetic Beauty, a passion for the Truth and a devotion to the Good.

How Do You Know There Is No God Who Is Our Cosmic Companion?

On the basis of available facts there is at present inadequate evidence to warrant to conclusion that a Divine Supreme Personality apart from man exists. The burden of proof is upon those who make the assertion, not upon those who disagree. In this case, the wish is father of the Heavenly Father. In the course of evolution the trend has been from simple to complex forms of life. Mind and personality at present seem to be the end-products of the evolutionary process. As David Hume noted many years ago, "It is just as logical to say that energy is primary as to say that Mind it." Since the time of Hume evidence has accumulated to show that it is **more** logical to hold that energy is primary.

If There Is No God, Who Made the World?

The religious humanist does not say there is no God. He may prefer to suspend judgment or redefine the term "God". The question, "Who made the world" in reality is not a question. It is a statement of conviction which asserts that the world was made and that a Supreme Being was responsible. The religious humanist does not know how all that is came to be. He does not know if the universe was created or is eternal. In complete candor he replies: "We really do not know the ultimate answers to the mystery of life."

Since We Do Not Know the Ultimate Answers Why Should We Surrender the Old Answers Given Us by Revelation?

Quite aside from substantial objections to revelation, the reasons are that those answers are woven into an authoritarian pattern and are given us in an authoritarian manner as though they were final and complete in themselves. To accept those answers under such circumstances is to commit intellectual or spiritual suicide.

If one poses the question thinking that the factor of imagination will provide ultimate answers and that the old answers are fabricated of the stuff of imagination and therefore are worthwhile, the humanist replies: "The lid to Pandora's box may be unlocked. The imagination not guided by reason will produce such distortions of reality that genuine progress will not ensue."

In Destroying the Supernatural Theology and Putting Religion To the Test of Reason You Are Taking Away from Multitudes a Source of Comfort and Strength

We do not seek to destroy but to transform. The Quaker who wants the way of silent worship may still worship in silence; the ritualistic churchman may still use ritual. The methods remain the same thereby giving some sense of stability to man's spiritual life. We would transform religion at its very heart, recognizing that through evolution man is the supreme being. We have reverence for the mystery of life. All the comfort and strength of religion remains. What has been destroyed is the unrealistic theological dualism of orthodoxy. That dualism which we term "supernaturalism" has thrived at the expense of man, causing man to deny his own power and project it onto a conjectural Heavenly Father. Religious humanism offers man more comfort and power than orthodox religion.

Religious Humanism Sounds Acceptable, but We Are Not Yet Ready for It. It Is a Religion for the Future.

Religious humanism is a growing faith which is ministering to a growing number of adherents, helping them to maturity. Why wait until the majority of men accepts it? Let us be among the first to be disciples of the Truth.

* * *

Man's greatest blunder has been in trying to make peace with the skies instead of making peace with his neighbors.

—Elbert Hubbard

MANAGING EDITOR'S COLUMN

Today is your day and mine, the only day we have, the day in which we play our part. What our part may signify in the great whole we may not understand; but we are here to play it, and now in our time. This we know: it is a part of action, not of whining. It is a part of love, not cynicism. It is for us to express love in terms of human helpfulness.—David Starr Jordan.

Again in this issue we endeavor to present a digest of materials that may be for those who think. You can help spread the word of the work of this magazine by passing it on to a friend when you are through with it.

Also send us a list of those whom you believe might be interested in learning more about it.

Your cooperation will be most helpful and greatly appreciated.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest for years at \$1.00 per year. \$..... enclosed herewith.

Please send information on how to become a member or form a chapter of the Humanist World Fellowship..... (Check)

NAME.....

ADDRESS

(Please type or print)

Add additional names on a separate sheet.

Mail to: HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

**1011 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley 2, California**

INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP defines religion in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

MODERN HUMANISM seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or ecclesiastical.

HUMANISM insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

HUMANISM recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradi-

cate racial antagonisms, national jealousies, class struggles, religious prejudices and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principles of justice, good will and service.

HUMANISM seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Institutions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

HUMANISM has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

HUMANISM accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future — for good or ill. The Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.

Josiah R. Bartlett
2441 LeConte Ave.
Berkeley 9, Calif. (e)